

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-19 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 - 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000-98415 (Mitsuru). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended and rewritten. More particularly, claim 1 now calls for the light emitting device to be mounted to the light receiving surface of the light guide. Claim 1 now also calls for the flexible substrate to be bent along the light receiving surface of the light guide. Mitsuru does not teach such a device. Moreover, Mitsuru does not contain any suggestion or motivation to utilize such a device.

Referring to Figures 1, 3, and 4 of Mitsuru, it can be seen that the light emitting diode 3 is not mounted to the light receiving surface 7a of the light guide. More specifically, there is a gap between the light emitting diode 3 and the light receiving surface 7a. As Mitsuru contains no suggestion or motivation to mount the light emitting device to the light receiving surface of the light guide, as claimed, it would not have been obvious.

With respect to dependent claims 3-8 and 19, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are not obvious for at least the same reasons as their independent base claim. Moreover, with respect to dependent claim 7, Applicants respectfully assert that this claim is not taught by Mitsuru. More specifically, the Examiner alleges that claim 7

is obvious in view of Mitsuru because Mitsuru teaches a light guide that is bent so that the light receiving surface thereof faces opposite to the pair of substrates in Figures 5a and 5b. Applicants respectfully assert, however, that claim 7, which is dependent on independent claim 1 also calls for a light emitting device to be mounted to the flexible substrate. Referring to Figures 5a and 5b of Mitsuru, it can be seen that the light emitting diode 3 is not mounted onto the flexible substrate 9, but rather another substrate 11. As such, Mitsuru contains no suggestion or motivation that renders claim 7 obvious. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection of claims 1 and 3-8 be withdrawn in view of Mitsuru.

Claims 9 – 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000-98415 (Mitsuru) in view of US 6,315,440 (Sato). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 has been amended to call for the a light emitting device to be mounted to the light receiving surface of the light guide. Further, claim 9 has been amended to call for the positioning means provided between the light emitting device and the light receiving surface of the light guide to be for mounting the light emitting device to the light receiving surface of the light guide. Neither Mitsuru nor Sato teach such a device. More particularly, the Examiner alleges that Sato teaches positioning means and therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the liquid crystal device of Mitsuru with Sato's teaching of positioning means to arrive at the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully assert, however, that neither Mitsuru nor Sato contain any suggestion or motivation to mount the light emitting device to the light receiving surface of the light guide with the claimed positioning means. Sato, rather, merely teaches positioning

through holes provided on the flexible substrate which are to be fitted with two positioning bosses on a holding member. This teaching, however, does not provide any motivation or suggestion to mount a light emitting device to a light guide with positioning means. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the claimed invention as a whole has not been considered.

Moreover, Applicants assert that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. More particularly, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there first must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. As stated above, however, neither Mitsuru, Satoh, nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests a liquid crystal device where a light emitting device is mounted to a light receiving surface of a light guide. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the proposed modification of Mitsuru with Satoh does not yield the claimed invention, and therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to independent claim 9 has not been established.

Claim 10-18 are dependent on claim 9 and are not obvious for at least the same reasons. Moreover, with respect to dependent claim 17, Applicants respectfully assert that this claim is not taught by Mitsuru or Satoh. More specifically, the Examiner alleges that claim 17 is obvious in view of Mitsuru and Satoh because, as stated above with respect to claim 7, Mitsuru teaches a light guide that is bent so that the light receiving surface thereof faces opposite to the pair of substrates in Figures 5a and 5b. Applicants respectfully assert, however, that claim 17, which is dependent on independent claim 9

also calls for a light emitting device to be mounted to the flexible substrate. Once more referring to Figures 5a and 5b of Mitsuru, it can be seen that the light emitting diode 3 is not mounted onto the flexible substrate 9, but rather another substrate 11. As such, the proposed combination of Mitsuru and Satoh does not yield the claimed invention and furthermore, contains no suggestion or motivation that would render claim 17 obvious.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

June 9, 2003

By: _____

G. Gregory Schivley
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BEW/JAH